

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action dated February 10, 2005. Claims 1-37 were examined. Claims 1-5, 8-16, 31, 32, 35, and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,218,602 to Grant et. al. Claims 17, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,027 to Lam et. al. Claims 18, 19, 22, 27 and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,274 to Kumar. Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant and Kumar and further in view of Lam. Claim 7 is allowed. Claims 6, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest that

for a particular transfer, the arbitration logic is coupled to receive an indication from a particular target node for the particular transfer as to whether the particular transfer can be supported in the particular target node,

as recited by claim 1. The Office action relies on col. 10, last paragraph through col. 11, first paragraph, to supply this teaching. That portion of Grant teaches a connection controller (CC) that receives service requests asserted by a request selector.

Request selector 151 uses a READY line, which is part of CC service request link 118, to control the flow of incoming service requests, by asserting the READY line when it is able to receive a new request. RB 90 uses the status of the READY line to set a request acknowledge bit going back to GC 88 on RB service acknowledge link 114.

(Col. 10, line 64-col. 11 line 2). The READY line of Grant is set by the request selector. The request selector is part of the CC of Grant. (Claim 11; col. 9, lines 51-58) The CC of Grant is part of interchange control system 86. (FIG. 3; col. 4, line 56-col. 5, line 2) The interchange

control system of Grant includes request buffers that serve at most four group controllers (GCs). (Col. 8, lines 43-48) The request buffers of Grant receive path acknowledgements from the connection controller and send release acknowledgements to gateways. (Col. 8, line 67-col. 9, line 9). Neither the path acknowledgements nor the release acknowledgement taught by Grant teach arbitration logic coupled to receive an indication from a particular target node for the particular transfer as to whether the particular transfer can be supported in the particular target node. Thus, Applicants maintain that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest

pipeline stages having equal length,

as recited by claim 4. The Office Action relies on Grant's teaching that the "[p]acket transfers occur within fixed intervals with respect to a packet frame", col. 5, lines 63-65, to teach that the pipeline stages have equal length. Although the operations of Grant are executed in parallel within a single frame period (col. 6, lines 33-34), nowhere does Grant teach pipeline stages having equal length, as claimed. Thus, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 4 is not anticipated by Grant.

Regarding independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest

the arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node.

The Office action relies on col. 10, last paragraph through col. 11, first paragraph, as teaching that limitation. That portion of Grant teaches how the connection controller (CC) receives and services the flow of incoming service requests. That portion of Grant also teaches operating a request queue and a holdover queue. But that portion of Grant does not teach, the arbitration logic communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet

from the initiator node, as claimed. For at least this reason Applicants maintain that claim 18 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 31, Applicants respectfully maintain that Grant, alone or in combination with other references of record, fails to teach or suggest that

during the arbitration stage, arbitration logic communicates with a target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from an initiator node.

The Office action relies on col. 10, last paragraph through col. 11, first paragraph, as teaching that limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. That portion of Grant teaches how the connection controller (CC) receives and services the flow of incoming service requests. That portion of Grant also teaches operating a request queue and a holdover queue. But that portion of Grant does not teach, that arbitration logic communicates with a target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from an initiator node, as claimed. For at least this reason Applicants maintain that claim 31 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 and all claims dependent thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 37, Applicants respectfully maintain that the art of record fails to teach or suggest

means for communicating with the target node during an individual one of the pipeline stages to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node,

as recited by claim 37. As pointed out above, Grant, alone or combined with the other references of record fail to teach communicating with the target node to determine if the target node can accept a packet from the initiator node. For at least this reason claim 37 is allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 37, be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,027 to Lam. Applicants believe that claims 17, 33, and 34 depend from allowable base claims and are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 19, 22, 27 and 30-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,274 to Kumar. Applicants believe that claims 18, 19, 22, 27 and 30-36 depend from allowable base claims and are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant and Kumar and further in view of Lam. Applicants believe that claims 23 and 24 depend from an allowable base claim and are allowable for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claim 7 and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, and 29. Applicants believe that claims 6, 20, 21, 25, 26, and 29 depend from allowable base claims and are allowable for at least this reason. Claim 28 is put in independent form.

In summary, claims 1-37 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.



PATENT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- ☒ deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☐ facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.

 5/10/05
Nicole Teitler Cave Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____

Respectfully submitted,



Nicole Teitler Cave, Reg. No. 54,021
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6315
(512) 338-6301 (fax)